UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

That Man "Amlie" - *Brent Dow Allinson*

Father Coughlin Is Guilty - *Harold P. Marley*

"How Diplomats Make War"— A Great Book Remembered - *John Haynes Holmes*

Released from Bondage—IV - - - - - - - - *Synnove Larsen Baasch*

A School Book for Nazis
A Book Review by Percy Dawson

VOLUME CXXII NUMBER 12

Chicago, February 20, 1939

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly Until Further Notice — *Subscription $3.00 Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY, Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* — CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Publication Committee

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, Chairman
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-Chairman
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER

FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Notes 179
Jottings—J. H. H. 181

ARTICLES—

That Man "Amlie"—BRENT DOW ALLINSON 182
Father Coughlin Is Guilty—HAROLD P. MARLEY 184
"How Diplomats Make War"—A Great Book Remembered—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 186
Released from Bondage—IV—SYNNOVE LARSEN BAASCH 188

POETRY—

Tolerance—ROBERT WHITAKER 185
They Will Not Learn—CLINTON RINGGO HULL 187
Questions for God—HOMER LEWIS SHEFFER 189
Though Gentile, I am Jew—RALPH CHEYNEY 191

THE STUDY TABLE—

A School Book for Nazis—PERCY DAWSON 190

THE FIELD—

The Reign of Terror—A. J. MUSTE 178

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

The Reign of Terror*

A. J. MUSTE

We share with our fellow-citizens of all faiths their horror in contemplating the reign of terror, directed especially though by no means exclusively at Jews, which has recently prevailed in Germany. Confessing the sins of others is cheap when looked at from the human standpoint and utterly worthless in the sight of God. Getting tremendously excited about symptoms and ignoring or even stimulating the causes which produce those symptoms is foolish and fatal. The reign of brute force, the exaltation of naked power, which causes such a revulsion in us as we see its fruits in Germany, is not a purely German product. It is not a supernatural visitation of God or devil for which there is no rational explanation, which we have done nothing to bring about, and can do nothing to stop.

Today we all stand indicted as murderers, terrorists and persecutors; as devotees of hate and violence; as traitors to the Prince of Peace: those Christian nations which a generation ago inaugurated this modern era of violence with a war about their imperialist interests which involved, directly and indirectly, the sacrifice of thirty million human beings; and all those churches, Jewish and Christian, which condoned and for the most part blessed that war.

All those nations and groups and individuals who are responsible for the so-called peace which followed that war, a peace of treason and revenge, which no one in his senses today seeks to justify and which has borne the fruits of hatred and cruelty and faith in violence which now turn to gall and wormwood in our mouths.

The people of the United States of virtually all sections and ranks and not least the workers and trade unionists, who sought to isolate this country from the rest of the world, to use its vast God-given resources for their own enrichment, to build high walls of immigration laws and tariffs around this land.

There is a direct and incontrovertible connection between this policy and economic distress and the rise of crude nationalisms and repulsive racisms in countries like Germany and Italy, and between these things and today's pogroms. All of us who shared in establishing or condoning or insufficiently combating those American policies helped to make the guns which are slaughtering Jews in Germany today. If some madman now pulls the trigger, does that mean there is no blood on our hands?

Likewise bearing, with Fascists and

*Statement read at "Service for the Victims of Oppression," November 20, 1938, attended by members of American International Church of Labor Temple and of the New York Group, Fellowship of Reconciliation.

(*Continued on page* 192)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXII MONDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1939 No. 12

LET US HAVE PEACE

I consider that peace at any price is preferable to war.
CICERO.

There never was a good war, or a bad peace.
FRANKLIN.

War is never a solution, it is an aggravation.
DISRAELI.

We should yield without fighting. . . . The consequences, both to ourselves and to the world, would be infinitely less terrible than the consequences of a war, even if it ended in complete victory.
BERTRAND RUSSELL.

Let us fight not against our enemies, but for them. In saving the world, let us save them too.
ROMAIN ROLLAND.

THE LANGUAGE OF PEACE

The appeal for peace addressed to "the leaders and people in the Great German Reich" last month by eighteen of the most eminent citizens of Great Britain, is a noble document. One cannot read its restrained and yet exalted language without being deeply moved. But who understands this language in Germany today? Certainly not "the leaders." Hitler can no more comprehend what these great Englishmen have in mind than he can read the original English text in which the appeal was written. The same applies to Goering and Goebbels and Funk. Imagine Streicher, the Nuremberg madman, being touched by this document! Newspaper comment has called attention to the fact that among the eighteen signatories are no less than five Nobel prize winners. But Hitler has outlawed the Nobel prizes from the Reich. These signatures on the appeal for peace can only be to him a source of aggravation. As for "the people of the Great German Reich," how can they be reached? The manifesto, to be sure, was sent out over the air in a German translation by the British Broadcasting Corporation, but we doubt if many thousands, or even hundreds, of German citizens dare to tune in on the English station. Under existing conditions, the masses of the German people are simply cut off from this sort of thing, and thus immune to influence. We commend this united effort of Britain's most important men to reach the minds of Germany in this hour of awful crisis, but the barrier of language remains. Not the mere words of an alien tongue, but the meaning behind those words! There was a time when the thinkers and leaders of the world had a single language and could speak together. This language was Latin, and its meaning was as universally understood as its words, for in those words was the rich freightage of the Christian religion. But now the common faith is as remote as the classic tongue is dead. Have we progressed through all these centuries? It's a question worth pondering.

"GOVERNMENT FLEES BARCELONA"

Exactly! That's what governments always do, and that's one of the reasons why we hate and despise governments in war and see no reason why any citizen should give to them allegiance. In Spain, the Loyalist government conscripted all the people, women as well as men. As Franco's armies drew near to Barcelona, the government suspended all business, set everybody to work digging trenches, and, though there were no guns with which to arm them, sent all males who were not ill or aged into the front lines. This is what is called "dying in the last ditch," "fighting to the last man," etc. Meanwhile the government—which means men in authority—skedaddled north toward the French frontier, ostensibly to save documents and what not, but actually to make sure of a good get-away before Franco's iron ring closed in. In doing this, the Loyalist government is not to be censured in any especial way, since it is only doing what every government does under like circumstances. Didn't our American government, in the War of 1812, run away from Washington when the redcoats came in sight? Didn't the French government in 1914 abandon Paris for Marseilles when the German hordes came pouring through Belgium into France? Wouldn't Franco's rebel government in Spain do the same, if the tables were reversed? This is the universal rule of cowardice and poltroonery—the civil officials responsible for the fighting keep always in the rear and when danger threatens desert the colors, while the soldiers, in no imaginable way responsible for what is going on, are forced to face the enemy—and die! We never behold this damnable drama but what we are once again confirmed in our conviction that we will never get rid of war until

we make the politicians do the fighting. Pass a law that any Congressman who votes for war, any President who signs a declaration of war, will instantly and automatically be conscripted for front-line service! As long as such a law was on the statute-books, there would be no war. (*Later!* As the Insurgent troops swept north of Barcelona, the Loyalist Government fled Spain altogether and left their people to perish.)

THE ROUND-TABLE ON PALESTINE

Whether the London round-table conference on Palestine will have finished its deliberations before this editorial is published, we cannot say. We think it will still be going on! But if not, and whatever its conclusions or non-conclusions, there are things we still want to say on this occasion for the heartening of all who believe in Zion's cause. First, the partition scheme is dead. UNITY has opposed this scheme consistently from the moment of its first announcement. It was to us a betrayal of everything that Jews had lived and died for since the days of Biblical exile, and not in all our life have we felt such grief and shame as when Jews—think of it!—consented to barter their ancient heritage for this imperial mess of pottage. That the scheme was absolutely preposterous from the practicable point of view—unworkable in every sentence and syllable of its program—should have been obvious even to a child. But it was its moral character which was so ghastly—its proposal to Israel to sell its soul for a few dunams of land! But this now is done for; partition will never be named again. Secondly, the break-up of Arab unity is now complete, or rapidly becoming so. At the London conference, the Arab representatives were able to put on an impressive show, especially as blessed by imperial Britain, but none knew better than these representatives themselves that they no longer speak for the Arab world. Of course, Israel is divided, too—it always is! But it is the collapse of the Arab front which is significant. As long as that front held, Britain could thwart Zion with a fine pretense of helplessness. But now that day is gone. Lastly, there is the strength of Zion itself, waxing through the years with a progress like that of the moving stars. Its people, its cities and villages, its investments, are as surely in Palestine to stay as Mt. Carmel itself. Nothing can remove, nor even greatly shake, this vast achievement of two generations of labor, suffering, sacrifice, and heroic triumph. Especially is Zion strong at this hour when she is the one sure land of refuge for Israel's persecuted multitudes. There may still be a long and stormy road ahead for the Jews in Palestine, but the winning of the goal is certain.

OUR CHARMING TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

We take great satisfaction in this country in our so-called two-party system. It's democracy at work, isn't it—this recognition of majority and minority pitted against each other in the common service of the nation? UNITY itself rejoiced in the outcome of the Congressional election in November last, if only because it restored the two-party arrangement which had been wrecked by the abnormal political conditions incident to the depression. A weakness of the Roosevelt regime was the absence of an independent, self-respecting, critical opposition party—and now this party was restored by the rehabilitation of the Republican Party in the recent election. Fine! But now Congress has assembled, the new opposition is in its seats—and see what is happening! On January 17th President Roosevelt revives the Passamaquoddy project—the wildest scheme, along with the famous idea of the two lines of trees to be planted from Canada to the Gulf, that ever appeared in the crazy quilt of the New Deal. It would seem as though nothing could make 'Quoddy worse than it actually was in the beginning, yet the President, with his unfailing ingenuity, has found a way by linking it up with the new defense plans of the nation. Just how it fits in hath not been revealed, but we are told that it does. All this on January 17th! Now what happens on the 18th? Senator Brewster, of Maine, a dyed-in-the-wool Republican, goes to see the Democratic leaders, to pledge his support of 'Quoddy! Here are the Republicans howling about extravagance, and voting down relief, and clamoring about a balanced budget—all shrewd opposition policies. And along comes a proposal to throw away hundreds of millions of dollars on a sheer Alice-in-Wonderland fantasy, and the Maine Republicans prepare to back up the scheme for the sake of the patronage and local business involved in its operation. Pour out the swill, and the pigs rush to the trough! A two-party system? We haven't got any two-party system in politics in this country. All we've got is the one-party plunderbund, with Democrats and Republicans playing the same old game as in days of yore. Our readers may think that the Democrats, or the Republicans, may save the state, but we don't!

YEATS

WILLIAM BUTLER YEATS, dead on January 29th last, was one of the great literary figures of these times. Since he fittingly won the Nobel Prize for Literature, it has become the fashion to speak of him as the greatest of all poets writing in English. This, we think, was an exaggeration. John Masefield, for example, we count a greater poet. Masefield's lyrics and sonnets match anything produced by Yeats, and his earlier narrative poems, such as "The Everlasting Mercy" and "Dauber," still stand supreme. But perhaps it is fruitless thus to balance merit in the field of genius. What is important is the fact that a great poet has passed, noble in achievement, immortal in fame, immeasurable in influence. Yeats' influence was surely his greatest

feat. His was the spirit as well as the example which led on the Irish literary renaissance, which is perhaps the most sensational revival of letters since Goethe, Schiller, and Lessing awakened Germany to new life. His also was the contribution which more than any other made possible the Irish National Theatre. The plays which he wrote for that great stage were not as notable as his poems, and were undoubtedly secondary to the dramas of Synge. But his was the inner light which radiated the whole—his soul the central shrine around which others gathered. If one would know how truly Irish Yeats' genius was, one has only to compare it with the genius of George Moore or Bernard Shaw, who became expatriated early. Yeats to the end was native to the core. The mysticism of Erin was in his heart, and suffused it with its unique and ineffable beauty. On any other soil than the "auld sod," he was as a spirit lost. Thus his famous anthology of modern verse he so overweighted with Irish verse as to make the volume valueless as a survey of the contemporary field of English song. On his last visit to America, he failed so completely to make contact with the land as to seem like some passing wraith. The quintessence of Irish genius was in Yeats—and, as this genius is all poetry, Yeats was the supreme Irish poet of all time. This is fame enough for any man, and the fame which he would have himself alone desired. It was fitting that his body was borne back to Dublin, to lie in soil where it could alone be happily at rest.

MISCELLANIA

The New York Theatre Guild has just produced Stefan Zweig's great Biblical drama, *Jeremiah*. This play, written during the World War, restores the ancient Hebrew prophet to our knowledge as the first of the absolute pacifists. When Nebuchadnezzar was beating upon the very gates of Jerusalem, Jeremiah counselled the surrender of the city in accordance with the principle of peace-at-any-price. Zweig's work is available in book form, and should be read as amazingly applicable to the present international crisis. * * * * In the February *Readers Digest* is an extraordinary article on Rabbi Henry Cohen, of Galveston, Texas. "At last," writes a friend, "I have found the perfect Christian—and he is a Jewish rabbi! * * * * Stuart Chase has some astonishing things to tell us in the February *Atlantic Monthly* on the decline of population in this and other western countries. A new face is coming upon our world. * * * * Read Rabbi Ferdinand M. Isserman's sermon on Jonah in the February issue of the *Christian Century Pulpit*, and learn what prophets still are speaking in our time. * * * * Prof. Joseph S. Davis, of Leland Stanford University, says that the trouble with the farms is that there are too many farmers. Instead of plowing under the corn and slaughtering the pigs, he would cut down the number of farmers. Sounds sensible! * * * * It is announced that Hitler is writing a sequel to his *Mein Kampf*. This is not surprising, as *Mein Kampf* has been the best-seller of all best-sellers. The German publishers estimate that almost 5,000,000 copies of this extraordinary work have been published in the Reich and various other countries. If the sequel does half as well, its author ought to be set up for life. * * * * See the movie, "Jesse James," and ponder what Hollywood can do in romanticizing a criminal and outlaw. If this isn't indecency, what is? * * * * And speaking of the movies, we have seen no such deluge of militaristic propaganda since the last war. Warships, bombing planes, marching soldiers, music, the flag—everything is being used to fire the popular heart to war. The hope of peace is like spitting in the wind: so long as this sort of thing goes on.

Jottings

Lord Northcliffe used to say that every good newspaper story must contain either one or all of three subjects: sex, the flag, and murder. Read your daily paper, and see the truth of this adage!

> "The Popular Front (in Spain) upon coming to power had been exceptionally lenient and magnanimous. . . A few churches and cloisters had been burned, but no banks had been touched." Pierre Van Paassen, in *Days of Our Years*.

The radicals, in other words, were guilty not of theft, but only of arson. They respected capitalist but not religious property. An exquisite distinction!

The *Christian Register* is running as its opening feature of the new year a series of articles on "Poetry and Devotion," by the Editor. The *Christian Leader* is running as its opening feature of the new year a series of articles on "Characters in the Tales of the Wayside Inn" by the Editor. Literature is one of the things that can keep us alive these days. We hope these articles are being read.

Recalling the January campaign against infantile paralysis, we find ourselves wondering if perhaps President Roosevelt's most beneficent contribution to humanity may not prove to be just this fight against this dread disease.

On a day we read of three people burned to death

in a house set on fire by "a misplaced cigar on the second floor." On the next day we read of a charming stage and screen actress "burned severely on the face, hands, and legs when her dress caught fire from a carelessly thrown match." On another day we read of a church fire caused by a lighted cigarette. What a price we pay for smoking!

If the radio stars go on strike, will static do the picketing? J. H. H.

That Man "Amlie"

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Thomas Ryum Amlie, the slow-speaking ex-Congressman from the first—nominally Republican—Wisconsin congressional district of Racine and its countryside, whom President Roosevelt has just nominated to a vacancy on the important Interstate Commerce Commission, is no crackpot doctrinaire or sophomoric Samson straining at the pillars of organized society, or hoping for a general collapse of capitalist economy as the precursor of a Red Utopia rising from its ashes. The legislature of Wisconsin to the contrary, he is a conservative-radical, or visionary-realist in disguise, and a hard thinking student of American economic theory, with a deep hatred of poverty and injustice—especially when there is no more excuse for them than selfishness, stupidity, and intellectual inertia.

I found him sitting in his shirt sleeves and avoiding news-photographers among sacks of congressional mail and piles of books and pamphlets in a stuffy attic storeroom of the old marble office building of the House of Representatives (in which he has served three terms), cheerfully riding out the political squall that has blown up over his appointment. He smiled a serious smile and tossed a typewritten statement to me, as I entered, with the remark: "Sit down, and read that!" He had just received it from the president of the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor, Henry Ohl, Jr., of Milwaukee, who was in the capital for a day and had prepared it for release to the newspapers—which did not publish it. I read:

> Labor in Wisconsin generally was pleased with the President's nomination of Thomas Amlie for the Interstate Commerce Commission post. The attack on him, which inspired a resolution in the Wisconsin legislature, can hardly be understood by people on the outside, until they become informed as to the unsocial caliber of the present (Democrat) majority of that body. Reactionaries and illiberals have combined for united action against labor's most rational demands. The condemnation of Amlie is one of the first acts of this Legislature, which indicates what may be expected of that body. The wild charges of Communism made against Mr. Amlie are refuted by the Communists' own attacks on him, from time to time. Those of us who know him best consider him a clear, rational thinker, and a consistent coöperator, swaying neither extremely to the right, nor so far to the left as to leave good reasoning behind.

"That's a good statement," I said. "It ought to be published in Washington but it won't be. . . . What do you think about your own qualifications for this job?"

"They say I'm no specialist in railroading or rate-making," he replied, in his slow, resonant northwestern voice. "And some of the Madison politicians are foolish enough to call me a Communist. They used to call Bob LaFollette, Sr., worse names than that, with even less excuse!"

"What would you like to say about it?" I inquired.

"Tom" Amlie leaned back against the wall in his chair, reflecting a long minute, and then observed philosophically: "On that matter of experts—specialists are useful on government commissions, of course. But in abnormal times, when the currents of national life are deeply disturbed and we confront not a normal business recession, but rather a major economic earthquake and permanent disaster—unless we can make far-reaching changes in our habitual methods and ideas—and when a profound dislocation has occurred which for ten years has eliminated something like 20 per cent of our people from our economic system, compelling them to starve or seek government aid—and no fundamental improvement is yet in sight—in such times we need more than narrow specialists or 'experts' in detail, who know more and more about less and less. We need a few men at the top of our policy-making governmental agencies who have some grasp of the interrelations of men and machines, of overall policy—some conception of why the system as a whole has broken down; and of how it may be re-galvanized without driving us into a war with some other troubled nation, as the only alternative to stagnation and demoralization. . . . That is why I have been studying for years the breakdown of our money-and-price system and the question of its rejuvenation, through the encouragement of industrial expansion,—which is the only possible means that I see of real recovery, and of making the system produce that general well-being which it once seemed to produce and of which I believe it may still be capable, if we can discover the key to the mystery."

"Then you really think that both the Socialist and Communist keys are rusty?" I asked.

"They are outworn," he drawled, "and they do not fit the American locks."

"Why?"

"So far as the traditional Socialist program is concerned," he answered, "no intelligent person can question its thoroughly logical and ethical approach. The natural resources and the essential means of production upon which the welfare of society depends ought, theoretically, to be owned and operated by society itself. The majority of the workers on the railroads of the United States would unquestionably favor government ownership of the carriers, now, if their opinions were secretly polled. Perhaps even a majority of their owners would favor it likewise, for that matter, since they have experienced so many headaches, and see so little outlook of profitable expansion or investment. We are in the tenth year of the depression, remember, with only such improvement as is due to government spending and war preparations on both sides of the ocean. But the Socialist solution is practically and politically impossible; and most of the Socialists them-

selves know it. For a long time it looked as if it would be possible to achieve the goal by gradual extension of the field of public ownership through political action and the taking over and socializing of the great utilities and essential natural monopolies and resources,—after fair compensation to their present owners. This was Socialism, and social democracy. But it has been demonstrated sufficiently by this time that the 4 per cent of our people who own or control 80 per cent of the nation's wealth and wealth-producing machinery are generally opposed to any plan of this kind, and that they will use their wealth and power in any way that they find effective to defeat it—so long, at least, as they see any chance of profit in retaining ownership of their properties. When they do not—when the railroads and the entire system sinks in bankruptcy—they may be willing, and even glad, to see the government buy them out. But we have not reached that point yet!"

"And the Communists?" I queried. "What about them?"

"They are the true Marxists," he replied. "But the time has passed—after the demonstrations of terror and tyranny in Soviet Russia and elsewhere—to believe that any such plan of violent overturn and proletarian dictatorship is either desirable or possible in a civilized democratic country. It has always seemed to me that there was little justification for any hope in such a program in the United States. I have, consequently, been condemned at length in the official publications of the Communist Party. I have long been convinced that the American people will never regain that equality of opportunity that has been an American heritage and boast by the traditional program of either the Socialists or the Communists. On the other hand, I am equally sure that the old order called *laissez-faire* or "rugged individualism" will never again work satisfactorily. I am convinced that the basic facts of production have changed since Marx and Engels examined the system and attempted to take it apart. In their day, the ruthless exploitation of labor at the source of production was obvious. Today, that is not the basic evil. Rather, it is *the permanent exclusion from employment and effective purchasing power of perhaps one-fifth of our adult population,* and the necessity of their maintenance by government aid, by government-made work, by the distribution of surplus commodities (without cash-transaction), or by the dole—which is the worst of all. I am absolutely convinced that the American people will be able to regain the equality of opportunity of which they dream *only when American industry is operating at something like full capacity,* instead of the estimated 50 per cent, or less, of full capacity at which it is now being operated."

"Is that the secret key that will unlock the door to the abundant life?" I asked. "If you know a passkey to security and plenty in the midst of all this misery and perplexity, in Heaven's name tell us what it is, and we will make you something more than a member of the Interstate Commerce Committee!"

"Well," he drawled again, and smiled a slow, engaging, Swedish smile, "have you ever heard of the Industrial Expansion Bill, which Congressman Jerry Voorhis, of California, Bob Allen, of Pennsylvania, and myself had the honor of introducing in the House of Representatives in the summer of 1937?" I said that I had heard of it, but not much more. "Then," continued the ex-Congressman, "suppose you look it over," and he tossed me a copy of it in a pamphlet (not printed at government expense), which, I judged, might be the contents of the huge sacks of mail heaped about the room. "There is, as I see it, a deadly parallel between what is happening in the United States today and what happened in Germany in the decade before Hitler's rise to power. If you think that vast numbers of unemployed Americans are going to remain inarticulate or politically impotent, while denied access to the means of honest self-support and excluded from the economic system through no basic fault of their own, you are very much mistaken."

"Idle men are always dangerous men," I answered, "to themselves and others."

"The liberals of this country—like yourself," said Amlie, pointedly, "might as well make your peace with the fact that the 80 per cent of our people who still have some place in the system, whether as owners and profit-takers, or merely as poorly-paid workers and farmers—who produce the 65 billion dollars that make up our national annual income—are not willing to take care of the 20 per cent who are kept outside. The action of the Senate in cutting down the President's minimum relief appropriation bill proves it. The argument that purchasing power given to these Americans would make greater prosperity possible for everybody has never had any great persuasive force with the average businessman and taxpayer, who will not assume the burden of 'keeping' his brother indefinitely, even on a minimum subsistence level. . . . The time has come when those who are seeking intelligently to improve the lot of the 'one-third of our people who are ill-fed, ill-clad and ill-housed,' as the President put it, must get behind a program of more fundamental reform than we have yet undertaken, and one that will have a chance—not to divide the people outside the system from those within it—but rather to unite the unemployed with those who are still at least partially employed, and those who are able to earn a meagre and precarious livelihood on the nation's farms—in short the 80 per cent of the American people who are able to enjoy only a most insecure and inadequate standard of living—in a constructive effort to rejuvenate and expand the industrial economy, and thereby make it yield new jobs and a vastly increased output of consumption goods for every honest man to enjoy."

"How can it be done?" I asked. "Certainly everybody in possession of his senses would like to do it!"

"Our plan," he said simply, "is to use the same instrumentalities of government and persuasion which the New Deal has forged to promote an artificial scarcity, and use them to achieve abundance. Our present temporary business revival is principally due to some twenty billion dollars of New Deal spending, and to the stimulating economic effect of vast preparations for the next world war, which is just around the corner. . . . If we are to avert such an act of collective insanity and suicide, it will only be as a result of a display of collective intelligence in setting up a system under which our industrial apparatus can operate at full capacity, to turn out the goods and services without which we cannot live as we want to live and might easily live. We can do this not so much by penalizing as by bribing private industry to expand itself, by hav-

ing the government underwrite most of the risk of stepping up production from a 65 to a 95, or even a 100, billion dollar level, annually. Under the provisions of the Industrial Expansion Act and the administration of a proposed Federal Industrial Expansion Authority, the government would contract with private industries, not to take them over and operate them as if they were munitions-plants in wartime, but to increase their production to a desired amount, to maintain or increase wages (but not prices), and thereby increase consumption—the government agreeing to underwrite the risk, or most of it, and to distribute all the unsalable surplusses—if there should be any—through the agency of the existing Surplus Commodities Corporation. The contracts would be of a nature similar to those of the A. A. A. with the farmers, which now operate to reward them for *not* producing, even for destroying, what our farms are capable of producing, and ought to produce, if our people are to be adequately fed and clothed. When this goal of expanded production and employment is attained, the expansion of consumption will follow as day follows night.

"We have approached this problem from the wrong end for ten years, by trying to peg wages, or maintain—even raise—prices by creating artificial scarcity. We have been blinded by our servitude to the price-system to the potentialities of our wonderful industrial apparatus. We have been blinded by our servitude to money, and have been afraid to lower interest-rates to a point that would really revive home-building, although we have guaranteed mortgages and thereby removed all the risk from the money-lenders, which once may have justified interest-rates of from 5 to 15 per cent. It is certain that if the American people had the coöperativeness of the Scandinavians, or the political competence and courage of the English and German governments acting under the fear of war, we should transform our waste and dearth and misery into abundance and security, within a few short years of coöperative effort; and we should never again tolerate a return to the disgraceful demoralization and waste of the present hour. If this sort of social intelligence and national planning be Communism—make the most of it!"

It is not Communism, of course—not even Socialism. It has nothing to do with proletarian dictatorship or class war, or hatred, or social convulsion. It is creative thinking—or so it seems to me—and it stems from the penetrating economic writing of another Scandinavian American, the late Professor Thorstein Veblen, and from his disciples. Among these are Harold Loeb and Mordecai Ezekiel, whose latest books, based upon careful economic surveys of the productive capacity of the United States are receiving the serious consideration of leaders of the present administration. And the bill is based upon the recent judgment and reasoning of the Supreme Court in upholding the constitutionality of the National Labor Relations Act, under the power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce.

In a word, "the Industrial Expansion Act proposes to reverse the present process of bringing about an artificial scarcity, and to base production upon human need instead of upon the ability of producers to extract a given money-price from consumers. The Act rests upon the economically sound thesis that production begets purchasing power, instead of purchasing begetting production. It further rests upon the . . . thesis that the way to make our producers prosperous is not to enable them to limit production and raise prices, but to induce them through agreements to make their money by selling a larger volume at a reduced price. This is clearly the only industrial policy that accords with the machine age."

Father Coughlin Is Guilty

HAROLD P. MARLEY

"Before you I stand as a defendant . . . I await your decision . . . so does America."

With this appeal, the radio priest of Royal Oak, Michigan, opened the door to the wave of criticism which has followed his recent attacks on persecution. Purporting to be against the anti-Semitism in Germany, they have been adroitly steered to attacks on the governments of Russia, Spain, and Mexico, with anti-Semitism and communist-baiting furnishing the wind for his sails.

In other words, when America decides on the guilt or innocence of this man it must do so, not on the basis of what he said in his first address on November 20th and the misquoting which followed, but on the whole tenure of his present series. In any trial, the jury is given a chance to see the crime re-enacted. Father Coughlin, by transcription, repeated his entire first speech in his second one. Thus, there is no doubt as to what he actually said. The difficulty is that so many failed to comprehend what he really meant. Countless people (there were 46 stations in the hook-up) including teachers and professionals, who listened with a casual ear, believed the address to be "all right," or even "fine."

Therefore, the vast jury of radio hearers can never bring in a verdict. Any decision must be "hung," even Catholics and Protestants, Liberals and Hundred-Percenters, being all divided. Even though he distinguished between "guilty" Jews and "innocent" Jews, those of the Semitic race might be unanimous in disapproval, and certainly the Communists would all cast a blackball in the hat. He not only styled them as a red serpent emanating from a cesspool, but he has since the beginning of his radio prominence been heaping up lies against them. In his 1930-31 series he listed almost two million official executions in 1923 in Russia, "martyred because they believe in their God and would not betray Him." He antedated the Fish Investigation Committee in his violent persecution of the followers of the "unspeakable Lenin." With this in view, it is easily seen why one of his hearers understood him to say that thirty millions was the grand total of executions in Russia, whereas he explicitly stated, and proved, that he had said only "twenty millions."

The key to Coughlin is not "gold standards" and the "international banker," but his extreme distrust of the governments which are putting into practice progressive economic systems. He contends that systems

are bad which make "slaves of millions in the midst of plenty." He takes a poke at the "greed of the money-changers and exploiters," but he never carries through. Even in this country, where there is no church persecution, he can raise the banner of "social justice" and at the same moment throw his weight against the New Deal. On the government reorganization bill, his last minute radio address did more than any other one thing to bury Congress in an avalanche of telegrams.

The thing for which the man who bows before the Crucified One really stands guilty before the bar, is the very thing he claims to oppose—social injustice. "Let us establish justice," he says, "social justice for all." This is the name of the organization he invited his listeners to join for one dollar, and it is the name of his weekly paper. There is no word which he uses more than "justice" and yet he is guilty of social injustice. Thus, if he is sincere, he must be convicted of the crime in the second degree and not the first. He does not premeditate injustice; he merely falls into it through the trapdoor of his powerful prejudices.

To repeat such stories as the drenching of three hundred nuns in kerosene and the burning of them alive, and to say that there is a price on the head of priests in Mexico City, is to be guilty of rank falsehood. To condemn the Washington government for recognizing Russia after a decade or more of strained relations, and to upbraid them for not recalling Josephus Daniels from Mexico, is to indicate that the Father Coughlin brand of social justice runs out before it gets to foreign soil—especially soil which is being returned to the people. It may also be argued that his "justice" does not even go across teeming Detroit to Dearborn. Never has this champion of the people condemned the Ford Motor Company for its anti-union policies, and in the present controversy over Coughlin and the Jew, it has even been thought advisable for Henry Ford to allow himself to be quoted. The former Jew-hater of *Dearborn Independent* days say that he is not against the Jews.

If Father Coughlin was bent on condemning all persecution, why was he silent on the Japanese invasion of China? Was it because the Catholic church is not directly concerned in this struggle? It must not be overlooked that silence is sometimes as eloquent as a polemic. His social injustice is not only due to his opposition to progressive economic systems, but to the malinformation which he presents to bear out his premise. It is not because Father Coughlin is a busy man and cannot track down his sources. He has an adequate research staff. The difficulty is that he goes to the wrong source. On the question, for instance, of the place of the Jew in the Russian Revolution, he did not go to Fr. Edmund A. Walsh of Georgetown University, who was once a Russian and wrote a book on *The Fall of the Russian Empire*. Instead, he selected a Dublin priest who teaches in a seminary, Denis Fahey, who wrote *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*. That the latter is no authority can be seen from the fact that he quotes another source, the *Documentation Catholique* of Paris.

With respect to the situation in Spain, Father Coughlin might easily refer to *Diary of My Times* by the devout Catholic, Georges Bernanos.

Imagine this man in his radio tower, referring to desecrated Barcelona with a sigh—not because of the destruction by Italian planes, but because in the city of a million there was but one little chapel left open! Can any religion which needs the office of the military to keep it running smoothly be called a religion at all? To use Coughlin's own argument, it is time the "innocent" Catholics used their influence on the "guilty" ones.

How can we judge a Fascist mind? By what it says, or by what it implies? Wouldn't Fascism called "Americanism" be just as odious? Let the sentence be rendered, not on the basis of casuistry but on the larger question involved of the power of the radio as a means of public education, particularly in times of crisis.

Let the figure of the monstrous crucifix built into the stone tower of the Shrine of the Little Flower, built by contributions from far and wide, become the figure of Justice—the familiar one seen on countless courthouse domes. Let Justice weigh the evidence, and with blindfolded impartiality render her decision. If this man is guilty, what is the sentence? Certainly not to be taken off the air—that was tried once. And certainly not to be put in jail like the Dr. Cook who said he discovered the North Pole. Let Father Coughlin be sentenced to visit a Communist meeting, to go to the U. S. S. R., and to be given a soapbox in the square where he will be forced to speak against the rough and tumble of the city noises and the heckling of the man on the street. Then let him go back to his tower far out on Woodward Avenue and tell the people of America what he has seen.

Father Coughlin, you have our decision. We await yours . . . so does America.

Tolerance

Abraham sat at the door of his tent
As the evening sun declined;
And a stranger came, footsore and spent,
Nor yet had the stranger dined.

So Abraham welcomed him; gave him seat;
And busied himself inside
Preparing the best that he had to eat,
As darkened the even-tide.

But the stranger bowed, three times bowed he,
Before the hearth-fire's flame;
And Abraham raged, that a heathen knee
So burdened his tent with shame.

"Out with you!" he cried, and he drove him forth,
Nor waited to feed him there.
And the stranger went, whether South or North
Abraham gave no care.

"Abraham! Abraham!" sounded then
The Voice of the Lord, Most High;
"Where is he who was with thee, when
The sun went down in the sky?"

Righteously Abraham gave reply;
"Not here! not here! is he,
Because he worshipped a heathen lie,
And knew not to worship Thee."

"Abraham! Abraham!" the Voice replied,
"He whom thou dids't invite
A hundred years I have not denied,
Could'st thou not be kind one night?"

ROBERT WHITAKER

"How Diplomats Make War"

A Great Book Remembered

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Francis Neilson's *How Diplomats Make War* is one of the classic books of World War literature. Published anonymously a quarter of a century ago, in 1915, it still holds its place as a standard work. Innumerable later writers have plowed deep in the soil first broken by this volume. Whole libraries have been reared on the foundation structure of its original and creative thought. But *How Diplomats Make War* stands memorable for its courage, vision, rigorous scholarship, and proud proclamation, in an age of fear and falsehood, of the truth.

Mr. Neilson's masterpiece is remarkable, first of all, as a pioneer work in that field of inquiry which has to do with the causes of the World War. By the early dawn of 1915, in all the Allied countries, and in America, the Satanic theory of the War was firmly established in the minds not only of the common people, but also of statesmen, scholars, and public leaders. This theory was in essence the doctrine that the Germany of Kaiser Wilhelm II, Chancellor Von Bethmann-Hollweg, and Admiral Von Tirpitz was exclusively responsible for the vast catastrophe of arms. The Triple Entente and allied nations, desirous of nothing but peace, had been bulldozed, threatened, browbeaten, and at last openly attacked, by a power which had long conspired against the settled order of mankind, and long prepared for its conquest and subjection! Germany was a guilty power which had assailed the innocence of the great democracies (strangely including Tsarist Russia)! The Kaiser was Satan making war against God and His angels in the heaven of modern civilization! This idea was of course a part of the propaganda necessary for the proper conduct of the great conflict. It was in part an honest deception induced on the one hand by the propaganda itself and on the other hand by the rationalization incident to any life-and-death struggle. At bottom it was an expression of the ancient human habit of thinking ourselves to be right and of course our enemies, and even our friends, to be wrong in altercation between us. In any case it was a settled impression, as firmly imbedded in men's minds as cement in a foundation wall.

Francis Neilson was the first man to break with this impression in a work of sound scholarship and popular appeal. There were others who saw the ridiculousness of the Satanic theory—G. Lowes Dickinson was one, and E. D. Morel was another. But *How Diplomats Make War* was a work at once so solid in fact and so fertile in suggestion, that it became the root from which sprang the vast growth of literature which has at last established in the annals of mankind the unassailable truth that all the warring nations of 1914 had responsibility for the War, with Germany by no means the most culpable of the lot. What Mr. Neilson did was to produce for the first time a comprehensive reading of the historical events preceding and producing the World War, which straightway became, and has since remained, the standard interpretation of the period, as witness such later works as those of Barnes, Fay, Gooch, and many others. He showed, on the basis of indubitable fact, (1) that all the imperialistic nations of Europe, the Triple Entente and the Triple Alliance alike, had played the diplomatic game of power to their own advantage, and to the final result of war, and (2) that this game of the diplomats was played in defiance of the real wishes of the people of all lands, and thus in betrayal of their interests. Nothing was more important, in Mr. Neilson's analysis of the situation, than his shocking revelation of the gulf which lies, even in the most democratic states, between the purposes of the people and the policies of their governments.

But Francis Neilson's work is remarkable not only for its understanding of the past, but also for its forecast of the future. Just as he saw that the tragic phenomenon of the War sprang not from the conspiratorial wickedness of the "Potsdam gang," but from the operation of economic and political forces of empire woven like so many threads into the devious pattern of diplomacy, so he saw that similar forces were at work in the War itself which made impossible any righteous or happy outcome of the struggle. Because he knew his history, Mr. Neilson was never fooled by any of the conventional notions, later transformed into veritable articles of faith, which had to do with "a war to end war," "a war to make the world safe for democracy," "a war to protect and preserve civilization." He knew perfectly well that the same men were in control of the War itself as had been in control of the policies preceding the War, that these men represented interests essentially selfish and violent and thus hostile to international order and to the general welfare of the world, and that these interests themselves embodied forces certain to lead the nations, after the war, straight back into the old paths of rivalry, enmity, military preparedness, and war again. The very fact of war, the fine flower of imperialistic diplomacy, doomed the ideals which sincere but sadly befooled men had introduced into the War, and for which millions of innocents were being slaughtered.

How Diplomats Make War was therefore as extraordinary for its anticipation of the future as for its interpretation of the past. As an example of accurate prophecy, a quarter of a century before the event, what can match the following passage from the concluding chapter (page 370), written at a time when it was rapturously believed that victory in the war would consummate the dream of a disarmed and peaceful world:

> After the war it is quite probable there will be greater governmental reasons for building up massive armaments than ever before. One has only to think of the position in Central Europe if Germany be utterly

*Introduction to a pamphlet republication of the last chapter of Mr. Neilson's book. Copies may be obtained of C. C. Nelson Publishing Co., Appleton, Wisconsin; 4 cents each.

> crushed. Will she be satisfied to let Russia become the greatest power in Europe? . . . What military and naval strength will Britain require to insist on nearly 80,000,000 of the Teutonic race in Europe remaining quiet? If in a comparatively few years France could rise again out of the dust of 1870, to be a Power great enough to seek alliances with Britain and Russia, surely any one with a grain of sense must realize what Germany will do in a far shorter space of time, It is not meet that statesmen should be expected to perform miracles of that nature. Let us then have done with the silly notion that a crushing defeat of Germany will mean disarmament.

Not many had the "grain of sense" to see what Mr. Neilson saw in 1915—that war would lead not to disarmament and peace, but only to greater armaments and more terrible war. Nor is that "grain of sense" in many minds today! For at this very moment when Mr. Neilson's prophecy is now fulfilled to the letter, there is waxing clamor for another war to crush Germany, disarm the world, and end war! The nursery-rhyme hero who jumped into a bramble-bush a second time to scratch in his eyes which had been scratched out in his first jump into the bush, was a paragon of wisdom as compared to the men who would today plunge into a second World War to regain what we lost, or never found, in the first World War.

Apart from the history and prophecy contained in its pages, Mr. Neilson's book has as its central feature the discussion of the armament problem. If the data of reason could dispel from men's minds the myth of preparedness, *How Diplomats Make War* would long since have accomplished this deliverance. Chapters VI and VII tell the whole story—the profit-motive behind the armament industry, the panicmongering which sustains and extends the business, the failure of "adequate national defense" to save nations from disaster, the surety with which this "defense" sweeps the nations into the very wars which through armaments they have sought to prevent—and the concluding chapter sums up the truth with a cogency of application to the problems of our western civilization which is unanswerable. "Armaments create wars, and militarism is at all times inimical to the real interests of the people" (page 375). But the myth persists. It clings to men's minds as a superstition which demoralizes reason, poisons passion, and nurtures the very fears which it would suppress. Having wrought the havoc of the last war, one might think that this superstition would at last be exorcised from the human consciousness, and mankind thus delivered. But here it is again at work in our contemporary world—the nations arming to the teeth on a scale three times more formidable (and expensive!) than that attained by the preparedness of pre-war days, and thus binding themselves to the very doom they would escape.

It is the prospect of America joining the current armament race—swept like a whirling chip into the stream of some swollen river!—that makes this whole question of instant and terrible concern to our people. Already an administration panicky over foreign alarms, and at the same time happy at the prospect of blanketing domestic failure with international bravado and excitement, has "let loose the dogs of war" in a preparedness program of utter madness. The Washington proposals would be incredible did we not know the infection of the preparedness mania, the desperation of the New Deal government for one more rabbit from the hat, the drive of the armament ring and the military upon politicians in and out of office, the unremitting and insidious influence of Britain to the end of seducing America once again to save the world (by which is meant, of course, the Empire!), and the demoralization of the people under the impact of a propaganda which can be matched for sheer wickedness only with the propaganda of the Reich. The militarists are in the saddle. They are driving us to war as straight and sure as they drove us in 1916-17, only the Wilson preparedness campaign was just a flea-bite as compared with the Roosevelt campaign of this hour. If armaments are adopted on any such scale as is now proposed, the doom of democracy is sealed. For under these conditions war will be as certain as America's own participation in a conflict which will end liberty and light upon the earth for a thousand years.

Nothing can save us but an uprising of the people against those who are betraying us in the name of preparedness, defense, security, and other dishonest slogans. There must be an instant awakening to the dangers which confront us. As a contribution to this awakening, it would be well if *How Diplomats Make War* could be republished in its entirety and circulated throughout the land. It is not to be supposed, however, that an old book, however important in its day, could thus be revived. In lieu of this, Mr. Neilson has reprinted his concluding chapter, "Aftermath," which is the summary of his argument and the substance of his appeal. "The last three paragraphs," wrote Albert J. Nock, when the book was originally published, "should be attentively considered by every one whose loyalty is loyalty to America and not to its office-holders. No more impressive lesson could America take to heart, than the fact that the nations who have suffered most in this war are those who spent most money to prepare for it; and by their preparedness provoked it—nay, created it and made it inevitable."

These words are even more urgent than they were a quarter of a century ago. The same truth stands—a more awful peril is at our gates!

They Will Not Learn

From the womb of Hate, by the war god, Mars,
Born and reared under evil stars,
Nursed at the veins of warrior dead,
Devouring the cause for which they bled,

Springs now, full grown, fierce Vengeance' lust.
Crushing the world to writhing dust.
Foul henchmen, marching at his side,
Stern visaged, match him stride for stride.

Distrust and Envy, Fear and Greed
Foster and further his dreadful creed.
As the Spectre of Death follows hard on their trail,
Grim reaping the harvest of Earth's travail.

And weak humanity, tribute pays,
In blood and grief, through fear-wracked days.
For they will not learn war breeds more war
To destroy the goal they struggle for.

CLINTON RINGGO HULL.

Released from Bondage

SYNNOVE LARSEN BAASCH

IV

We cannot expect that even good people can become perfect over night. They must have time to gain self-reliance, to outgrow their bitterness against past injustice, and to get over an attitude of petty deceitfulness that develops where people have been cheated in one way or another all of their lives. When the LaForge Coöperative Association had just bought the cotton gin, its leading men sat together with Hans H. Baasch, the community manager, planning its future operation. At that time they said, "This gin here has cheated us for years and years, and we shall make it give back to us as much as it has taken." It was said with bitterness and with determination. If these men succeed, will they retain their bitterness? And if they shed their faults that have been created by their difficulties, will they also lose their great virtues,—their humor, their love of living, their adaptability, their capacity to be happy in the moment? Will the Negroes retain that courtesy which their fathers learned in the households of older times? Or will they acquire the cockiness of the upstart, and discard the dignity of their folk culture? It is going to be a difficult thing to retain that dignity without making it conscious of itself, but the experiment is worth making. The evils of the present situation are so dominant that a risk must be taken to rout them, and the risk has to be taken with people as they are, with the average run of farm-workers as they are found on the land.

For that reason there was no question of family selection on the Farm Security Administration project in Southeast Missouri; people were accepted if they were living on the land and wanted to continue there. It is too early to say definitely whether they will succeed or not. So far, they have had all the gaiety and excitement that went with buying tools and furniture, with having money (borrowed from the government) with which to meet their doctors' bills and other expenses until crop money became available. There have been a number of weddings, hurried up to make bachelors eligible for the government program. Trucks have moved up and down the roads with panels for the new houses, with furniture, with goods from the store; every Saturday for several months a number of families have moved from their old shacks into the neat, airy, new cottages provided by the government. This kind of excitement went on into June. But when construction was over, when the engineers and the workmen had left, and the farmers were through ploughing, and yet not harvesting, during that lull they needed sympathetic guidance. Later when the harvest had begun, these people needed more guidance than ever, not against boredom, but against temptation to spend money carelessly before they had repaid their government loans. All the way through, there must be a steady spirit that leads on toward elimination of disease and toward a better education of the young people. Cleanliness and good health habits already have been built up among the members of the group to such an extent that it is possible to tell improvement every week.

There is nothing exciting about cleanliness, regular visits to doctor and dentist, and hoeing. When the harvesting is in process, the whole countryside is excited with it, and the project farmers are tempted to follow their customs of former years, to spend quickly what little was gained through the whole year. Even last spring, when there were so many unusual and pleasant happenings, some few of the farmers needed firm guidance. They were still unused to a planned existence. For this reason the checks which the farmers write on the government loan money have to be countersigned by the community manager. In many instances the farmers are reluctant to assume the responsibility that is put upon them. For example, when the farm machinery was being exhibited and the men were being urged to make their choice, they very often tried to make Mr. Baasch or Mr. Baker (the farm manager) decide for them: "You decide that." —"You know best."—"You know what we ought to have; we trust you." The tendency to allow others to make important decisions in matters that affect themselves is very strong in many of the men. But each time that tendency appears, it does also give an opportunity to encourage that self-reliance which is necessary if a man is going to maintain his independence. It seems as if the farmers are now anxious to make up for the distrust they showed earlier; but if they cannot take decision upon themselves when spending their own money for implements which they themselves will use, how will they stand up later against outside pressure that would lead them to spend their money unwisely? The thing that can destroy the success of the people will be the lack of adequate protection of earned income.

The building of self-reliance is bound to take years; but cockiness, unfortunately, will shoot up overnight like a toadstool, even among people who through no virtue of their own are enjoying this opportunity. When the farm machinery was exhibited, it attracted many visitors from the outside as well as project farmers and children. It must have been a hard thing to take for those on the outside. Such a situation does not become any better when one Negro that is established on the project cries out to another on the outside. "You folks is just niggers; but us folks, we is colored folks now!"

Yes, it is ludicrous and pathetic that people should have such rungs on their social ladders. And it is dangerous that one ignorant youth shall use his power to give insult, and thus create animosity against the entire project. For that reason, a very firm guidance is necessary over these men, some of whom may act as silly, ill-bred children will do. Side by side with such overgrown children are working serious men who are accepting their chance with a deep glow of humility in their gratitude. As one of the farmers, who serves as a preacher on Sundays, said, "I often thought I'd move, but somehow I didn't. Guess it must have been the Lord that kept me here."

And maybe the Lord did. The people on the land are so poor that there is very little material compensation for a preacher.

But these are just two examples of attitudes.

Among the farmers on the project you can find as many types as there are individuals—these men are not at all to be sorted into two groups: Good and Bad. Here are men of high intelligence, men who formerly had no better outlet for their energies than politics and distilling, and who now are giving their services to the coöperative association. They do not expect to become wealthy, but they do expect to become established in modest security. Then there are other people who are pluggers that work ahead faithfully. And their wives help them. When one plowshare becomes blunt, the wife takes it to the blacksmith to save time for her husband, who is using the other share meanwhile.

The government men who are working on the project do not expect many of the families to fail. True, some of the housewives have to learn to keep a cleaner house, and some of the men are careless with their expenses; but the majority work hard. As one becomes acquainted with the individual members of the coöperative group, one is moved to admiration. What miracle has preserved in so many of them an insistence on courtesy and cleanliness? Is it good old human nature that simply will not be changed, no matter how badly handicapped by poverty and sickness? How have people retained their self-respect under such hardship? Every day there is some incident that confirms the faith placed in these ordinary farmers, taken just where they were found, without any weeding or selection of any kind.

There are incidents that deserve to be remembered. On the project lives an elderly Negro named Sam, who has a natural talent for dealing with animals. Last year, Sam broke in a team of mares for a landowner in the neighborhood, and became very fond of them. This year, when Sam was to buy the team of mules granted by the government, he asked for permission to buy a team of mares instead; of course, he got the permission, for the project needs breeding mares, and Sam is the right man to handle them. Never had Sam hoped to own the mares he had trained the year before,—but here joy came to him beyond his tallest dreams! The very horses he loved were for sale, and Sam bought them and took them home to his wife. She was as happy as he. In the night this elderly couple lay awake, with the door open, to listen to the horses so that no harm should come to them. "We didn't sleep a wink all night!" the wife said, radiantly, to Miss Neprud, who has been lent from the General Farm Security Administration offices in Indianapolis, and who has been in the district so long that she seems to belong on the project.

When the land was bought last Christmas, Sam could neither read nor write, and when his loan was signed he "touched the pen," that is, he made his cross-mark instead of writing his name.

"Sam," said Mr. Baasch to him, "aren't there any children around where you live, and don't they go to school?"

"Yes, sir!"

"Why don't you sit down with them some time and have them show you how to write your name?"

Three months later Sam was in the manager's office again and had occasion to "touch the pen"; but this time he signed his name, and asked that the people in the Regional Office be notified that he was the same man, so that there should be no confusion about his different signature. We who have been writing since childhood do not, perhaps, realize the size of his achievement. Am I wrong if I compare it to the learning of a new language?

When you deal with men like Sam, you cannot bear the thought of all the unknown men throughout the country who labor under like difficulties. Is it really true that there are some within this enlightened and democratic nation who would deny such a man his chance of frugal independence? Is it really true that even a democracy needs a suppressed class to make bigger sacrifices than do all others, without getting any of the advantages that can be had in a democracy?

The honest landowners in this part of the country are being hard pressed. No new mansions are going up to replace those that sink into disrepair. Floods, soil depletion, a variable market are wrecking the accumulations of wealth in the region. The farm workers have never enjoyed the wealth, but they are bearing the brunt of the poverty that is stealing upon the land. The charity of private individuals is almost futile here, and the arguments of politicians can only create cleavage—only those who live here know how dangerous demagogic ranting can be. This is a place where mutual understanding and coöperation are absolutely necessary. The project must not be seen as an outgrowth of this or that management, but as an experiment which, whether it succeeds or fails, will furnish experience on which the nation can build toward a better future, not for this or that group but for all.

Many questions of practical value will be answered by this project. But we, the spectators, who see the farmers and their wives and children day by day, and who marvel at their good humor and endurance and resourcefulness,—we who have seen them some Sunday, abandoned to an animal enjoyment of the sweet spring days in the swamps beyond the levee, we are apt to ask another question, too. The utilitarian sourness which permeates so much of our everyday life, will it penetrate to these people, too, when their standard of living is raised? When the malaria rate has been lowered with the aid of better screening, when typhoid is gone because of greater cleanliness and a better water supply, when children are better nourished, and teeth repaired before they poison people, when the churches return the interest which these people take in spiritual matters—will these people then lose their capacity for adjustment and their beautiful joy in living? If so, why should they? Well, let us run the risk anyway. We cannot hope to change human nature, and we do not need to; but we do want to grant decent living conditions to our fellow men.

Would projects of this nature be the answer to that which the President calls "The Nation's Problem Number One"—three and a half million landless farmers of the South?

Questions for God

O God, if thou art good and wise
What means this pain, the human ill
That tears our hearts? We agonize
And slowly, surely feel death's chill.
Is man a freak creation's end?
Does man who plans devise for naught?
Do heart and mind on flesh depend
And turn to dust—their love and thought?

HOMER LEWIS SHEFFER

The Study Table

A School Book for Nazis

THE NAZI PRIMER. Translated by H. L. Childs. *New York: Harper and Brothers.* 1938. (This is the recent official handbook for the schooling of the Hitler Youth.)

Introduction. Factual outlook on life. "The world outlook of National Socialism is today the common possession of all Germans. All well-disposed and unprejudiced comrades have made the ideals of National Socialism so much a part of themselves that they give firm support and direction in every situation of life." (p. 1.) "Without regard to place every German anywhere can coöperate by thought and deed in political, cultural, and economic upbuilding." (p. 2.) "The earlier philosophic suppositions were . . . unrealistic theories. . . ." Today, "All questions of our national life have become so clear, simple, and definite that every comrade can understand them and coöperate in their solution." "The most significant and most efficacious realities in the life of a people are 'Blood and Soil'." (p. 4.)

Chapter 1. The unlikeness of men. It is obvious that men are unlike physically. There are also mental and spiritual distinctions. For example, some men think work a curse and that courage and loyalty are stupid! So there is a chasm separating those of German blood from Jews. "Times gone by have ignored the unlikeness of men." (p. 7.) "Even in our day . . . certain men have no feeling for race honor or race shame." ". . . the racial ideas of National Socialism have implacable opponents. Free Masons, Marxists, and the Christian Church join hands . . . on this point." "Under Jewish leadership Marxism intends to bring together everyone 'who bears the face of man'." (p. 9.) Still the race idea is gaining ground. This is seen in the fact that the immigration laws of many states overseas do not let Jews or other undesirables into the country.

Chapter 2. The German races. "A race is a collection of individuals differentiated from every other group (constituted in such a way) by its unique combination of bodily characteristics and soul attributes, and continues to reproduce its own kind." (p. 14.) "Actually pure races of people scarcely exist today." But in different peoples the proportion of the races is different. Thus the Germans are 50 per cent of the Nordic race and 50 per cent of a closely kindred race, the Phælic race (Westphalia). Six European races are described physically, and, more briefly, in respect to mind and soul. So the reader may see for himself the superiority of the Nordic and Phælic races.

Chapter 3. Race formation: heredity and environment. Brief presentation of Mendel's laws which are assumed to hold good in respect to the characteristics of mind and soul in man. "There are . . . many races in the German people which have intermixed." ". . . these races have transmitted characteristics of body and mind and soul independently of one another. Therefore, a man who appears to be an Easterner [one of the six races, now occurring in France, Holland, Italy, etc. (p. 28)] externally need not necessarily possess the Eastern character [i. e., unwarlike, compliant, and submissive, inclined to craftiness, lacking the spirit of rulers (p. 31)], just as a Western man need not possess a Western character. A Nordic nature can, therefore, very well belong to a man bodily of another race." "We will appraise our comrades, in the last analysis, according to their character and performance." (p. 58).

Chapter 4. Heredity and race fostering. ". . . all families and branches of a people have a common origin. They have a unified heritage which is continued into the future. . . ." (p. 61) The stream of heredity may suffer pollution in two ways, through disease, poisons, e. g. (p. 17) alcohol. (p. 62) Secondly, it may be "defiled by being mixed with blood that is essentially and racially foreign to it." (p. 62) Nature and desirability of eugenics presented.

"The fighting period, by reason of its daily sacrifice of blood and goods, naturally brought with it the severest processes of selection." During peace the selection must be performed by the educational institutions operating all along the line to select and train for leadership.

"The German people have direct contact only with one type of foreign people: with the Jews. So for us fostering race is one and the same thing as a defensive warfare against mind and blood contamination by the Jews." (p. 77)

"Anyone belonging to a non-German or related race is considered a member of a foreign race. . . ." "People insist on finding in this racial outlook on life haughtiness and intolerance. To do so is fundamentally false, however. We regret the idea of race-mixing, first, because the hybrid produced by the mixing is a sacrifice to . . . a disregard of nature. . . ." "In the second place we believe that races receive their different natures in order to develop them and not to mix them." (p. 82)

Chapter 5. Population policy. "Selection . . . is possible only when a sufficiently large number of persons is at hand. Therefore, it is the duty of the leaders of the people who are conscious of their responsibility to be concerned about having as large a population as possible." (p. 84) "The German people at the moment is no longer a growing folk." (p. 85) The apparent increase in population is due to the prolongation of the life span and not to increase in birth rate. Indeed the decline in birth rate is actually terrifying, (p. 89) and if this decline were to continue at its present rate, "the German people could no longer maintain their position in the world and would sink into insignificance." There are two causes of this low birth rate, (1) unwillingness to be bothered by children, and (2) economic reasons. Regarding the latter, the opinion has been widespread "that over-population increased unemployment and limited the well-being of the individual. Nevertheless the situation is exactly reversed fundamentally, as a moment's reflection shows. A large number of children consume much more than a smaller number. It gives all callings more work and bread for that reason. The production of goods rises and with it the well-being also." (p. 95)

Chapter 6. Man and earth. "The historical accomplishments as well as the present life of a people are primarily determined by blood." Although it is true that "men make history" still what can be made is conditioned by the material, not only racially but also territorially. (p. 101)

Chapter 7. The German territory. "By German territory we mean every region of central Europe which is inhabited by Germans in more or less permanent settlements and has received its cultural imprint from the German people." This territory occupies central Europe. Other states occupy the "rim" of Europe. This central position has made Germany the battle-ground of peoples and ideas. During this century "our people had to struggle with the ideas of western liberalism and eastern Bolshevism." (p. 106) Beyond the borders of the political area extends the area of German population and beyond that again the region affected by German culture.

Chapter 8. The German population area. "After the disappearance of glacial ice, the Norsemen descended into the western regions along the sea." "They developed a high agrarian culture. They were of the Nordic and Phælic races. They multiplied rapidly and spread throughout Europe. "The culture of Europe and particularly that of antiquity, as well as all that is today based thereon, does not come out of the East. Its origin lies in the North, to a considerable extent on German soil." The Germans are the result of the amalgamation of the Nordic and Phælic peoples in the early stone age, a unified people internally and externally. After the fall of Rome, the Germans spread all over Europe, from Iceland to North Africa, "the Urals to Gibraltar." (p. 127) Thus Europe achieved unity for the first time.

Chapter 9. The German culture area. "Thus the whole of the territory of western Europe is overset with islands of Germans. They have exerted a strong cultural influence on their environment." "These islands are the radiating points for efforts to raise the level of soil cultivation, for better housing, for cultivating the handicrafts, and for developing the scientific spirit. . . ." In the United States of America most of the ten to twelve millions of German origin have not remained "German conscious." "It is estimated that there are three million German-speaking persons in the United States of America today. After the War they joined together and founded a flourishing press and associational life." (p. 161) The German colonies "opened up and explored by Germans, . . . have thereby received a German imprint." "There follows a discussion and a map of the colonies which were taken from the Germans at Versailles. "The lie regarding colonies, which is refuted by the German successes and by the natives themselves, was intended merely to veil and to excuse the robbery."

Chapter 10. The political area of the German folk. History of the alternate extension and retraction of this area. Map showing territorial losses at Versailles and St. Germain. "Since the War, Germans have been partitioned among fifteen states; fourteen lands wedge into the German population area; twenty-five neighboring peoples live in direct contact with the German people. The result is that German youth is being brought up according to fifteen different ideologies, that the boundaries of numerous countries separate Germans from Germans. These facts make it a duty of the German people not to confine its thinking and dealing merely to the political area of Germany, but to learn to think in terms of their folk policy." (p. 194)

Chapter 11. Territory and population. The population density is high in Germany. (p. 202) If that of England, Holland, and Belgium is greater, it is to be remembered that these countries have enormous colonial possessions. (p. 205) "Our claim for a corresponding share of earthly possessions, of raw materials, and foodstuffs is based on the past and present achievements of our people in all spheres of life. Only blind hate or lack of political wisdom can deny this inalienable claim."

Chapter 12. The soil as a source of food. A discussion of the soil and products of the political area; also of what National Socialism has done to promote and enrich agriculture.

Chapter 13. The land as a support for industry. A discussion of raw materials found in Germany and of necessary imports. "To obviate our scarcity of raw materials the return of our former colonies is absolutely necessary. The Leader has emphasized again and again that Germany as a great industrial country can never renounce its colonies." "Germany would . . . willingly buy from abroad the raw materials" but for the tariffs against German goods. "The Leader has, for this reason, announced the Four Year Plan, which is to free the German Reich from the necessity of importing raw materials." Discussion of Buna and other products. "It must be obvious to every German comrade that if he supports these efforts by using Germany's own products, then the slogan will soon be fulfilled: German Work Out of German Raw Materials." (p. 255)

I have tried to be quite fair in selecting my excerpts from this remarkable book and in my summarizing of important passages. If I have equalled the praiseworthy objectivity of Professor Child's preface, I shall indeed be satisfied.

Doubtless the reader will find my synopsis too sketchy. It *is* sketchy and necessarily so. It is a sketch of a sketch. For the Nazi primer is also sketchy. Being a primer it is almost without documentation; it abounds in condensations and abridgments and inconsistencies. One expects this sort of thing in an elementary textbook, especially a first edition.

But when all due allowance has been made for unavoidable defects, what have we? What sort of a book is this anyway? When the reader has thought his thoughts and said his say, it will probably be unnecessary for me to comment further.

PERCY DAWSON

Though Gentile, I Am Jew

(Dedicated to one of the world's great poets, Louis Ginsberg)

I am a Jew, although within my veins
—How deep the feelings, faiths, the bloodstream stains!—
No single drop from ancient Jewry flows.
A Jew by right of mutual taunts and throes!
Not blood alone is kinship's source but brains.

Who hearing Jewish music's molten strains,
Who viewing highest peaks the soul attains,
Can help declare the spirit truth to foes,
"I am a Jew!"

Each banishes his spirit who disdains;
Each binds himself to every soul he pains.
We weld all lives to Life with prayers, with blows.
Yet we the Ingrate, Man, still mostly close
Our doors to God when "Partly," He explains,
"I am a Jew."

RALPH CHEYNEY.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 178)

Nazis, the guilt of what is happening now are Communists who built up a theoretical justification for dictatorship, repression, wholesale espionage, wholesale liquidation of churches and of groups in the population regarded as undesirable or recalcitrant, and who practised these things in Russia before either Mussolini or Hitler were figures of importance, and who in Russia are today practising these things.

There are multitudes known as liberals and progressives, not a few Protestant and Jewish leaders and people, who glossed over or even built up a justification for the "liquidation" of millions of Russian peasants—death for three to five million of them—a few years ago when agriculture was being collectivized, and who failed to get much excited over the persecution of Catholics in Russia, Spain, Mexico, and other lands. All of us who may in some measure have shared this attitude ought to try to understand now, in deep contrition, that not only Hitler but plenty of simple German citizens find it hard to comprehend why, after all this, the world should be so disturbed over the "liquidation" of half a million Jews.

Also guilty are the Roman Catholics in considerable numbers who have condoned and supported totalitarian regimes in Austria, Spain and South American countries when they seemed friendly to their church and who, to put it mildly, failed to rebuke with vigor the brutalities of such regimes including the bombing of civilian populations.

Guilty above all are we who call ourselves Christians, believers in peace, pacifists, who have been weak in the faith; who often in our own lives have been ruled by the spirit of fear and hate and not of reconciliation; and who have not begun to give to our God of love anything like the devotion with which others fling themselves upon the altars of false gods.

In view of these things, there are certain things we cannot do and which we must plead with our fellow-citizens not to do.

We deplore the chanting of hymns of hate against Germany and Hitler and any other nations or individuals. We have all come to realize that doing so against the Kaiser twenty years ago was foolish as well as un-Christian. He was no more and no less guilty than many others on both sides. Depriving him of all power and making him the helpless exile of Doorn did not bring peace and well-being to our world.

We oppose the making of belligerent diplomatic gestures such as withdrawing the United States ambassador from Germany temporarily. Moral protests can be registered in other ways. Except as part of a policy which contemplates the possibility or even the probability of war, such diplomatic actions make no sense.

We oppose the armament policy of the Roosevelt administration which cannot by any stretch of imagination or of language be justified as a policy of defense of American soil, which will rapidly place our economy on a war basis and present our people presently with a seeming choice between a disastrous depression following the collapse of the armament boom or a war adventure.

We oppose the policy of making the North and South American continents an exclusive preserve of United States imperialism and condemn in particular the dangerous hypocrisy of camouflaging this policy by calling it one of "an alliance in defence of democracy against Fascism" between the "Colossus of the North" and Latin American nations, the overwhelming majority of which are themselves ruled by dictatorships or oligarchies.

We deprecate the perversion of the sound aims of a trade treaty policy represented in the tendency to build up pacts with so-called democratic nations and others which do not threaten our imperialist interests but exclude other nations. Insofar as such a course is calculated to bring even more severe economic pressure upon some nations, it is a continuation of the policies which have brought disaster to the world. It can only lead to general war which will inevitably multiply disaster a thousandfold. For the same reason we deprecate any organized economic boycott of certain nations, though fully recognizing that the individual's conscience must decide whether his personal moral protest against evil should take the form of boycott.

There are, on the other hand, things which a penitent, objective and serious mind will lead us to do—

We join in moral protest against all discrimination, cruelty, and terrorism. We abhor what is taking place in Germany today. We pray that we may be so sensitive to all inhumanity and evil that we can see them and fight them even in ourselves. Especially do we pledge ourselves anew to combat every manifestation of anti-Semitism and of anti-Negro prejudice in this country.

We pledge ourselves to give sacrificially of our means and service to relieve the distress of victims of oppression, using so far as possible agencies which do not themselves discriminate on racial, religious, class or other grounds.

We urge the President and Congress to take steps to see to it that the United States takes its full share of responsibility for providing asylum for victims of oppression, even if this should require real sacrifices on our part and drastic revision of our immigration laws.

We pledge ourselves to the defence of the liberties of speech, press, assemblage, and worship for all in this country.

Since economic injustice and distress bring about repression, we pledge ourselves anew to support the struggle for economic justice and an equitable distribution of the income of the nation.

We shall work for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to give the people the right to vote on a declaration of war. So long as the President can virtually decide for the nation at this most crucial point, our democracy is largely a mockery.

We urge that the President take the initiative in immediately convening a world conference to make a just peace dealing with basic economic issues such as access to raw materials and tariffs *before* another war. Experience has shown that it is virtually inconceivable that such a peace should be written *after* another World War.

The roots of the inhumanity and oppressions of our day are spiritual as well as economic. We are witnessing the culmination of several centuries during which western civilization has espoused a philosophy of humanism which has placed man at the center of the universe, has seen in man the highest form of being that it knew, has regarded the liberation and self-expression of the human being as the highest end, and has pushed God out of the picture. Unquestionably important values have been achieved during these centuries, and it may seem paradoxical indeed that at the culmination of a regime of humanism we should find the human being everywhere a cog in an industrial machine or a pawn in the hands of a totalitarian party or state, and should find liberated man practising the most bestial inhumanities.

Nothing is more important than that we should understand that this is not an accident. When men really come to believe that there is nothing higher than man in the universe, they will not be able for long to respect and trust themselves. Men who do not bow the knee to God will somehow be found bowing the knee to the beast in themselves. We are called humbly to worship and believe in God revealed to us in Jesus.

The name of this God is love. And in this dark and tragic hour when on every hand we see the last hideous result of the belief that evil can overcome evil, that the sword is a more effective weapon of justice and redemption than the Cross, we proclaim more confidently than ever this conviction, expressed in Edward Arlington Robinson's lines:

"And if God be God, He is love;
And though the dawn be still so dim,
It shows us we have played enough
With creeds that make a fiend of Him."

Humbly we shall strive to obey our Lord's command to love our enemies and to pray for Hitler and the Nazis and all including ourselves who yield to lust for power, as He prayed on the Cross: "Father, forgive them for they know not what they do."

And with more confidence than ever we call upon the churches of Christ throughout the world utterly and unequivocally to renounce war, to proclaim and live their faith in the way of the Cross. This will indeed be very costly; but hardly so much as the course upon which mankind is now embarked. If the churches were to do this, multitudes would sing again, and know what they mean when they sing: "In the Cross of Christ I glory, towering o'er the wrecks of time." And of us and of our age it might yet be said: "These are they that have come out of the great tribulation and have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. . . . Therefore are they before the throne of God and they serve Him day and night in His Temple. . . . And God shall wipe away every tear from their eyes."